

179/01406 A04

REMARKS

The present response is filed with a request for a three-month extension to reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

The present application contains 31 claims of which claims 1, 29 are independent claims. Claims 1-31 stand rejected. In the present amendment claims 1 and 29 are amended.

In the Examiner's response to arguments filed by the applicant on September 9, 2003, the Examiner submits that contrary to the filed arguments "the image on the first and second surface and the image on the second surface are modified and are thus not identical to each other or to the resultant image". Thus this limitation will not be read into the claims and the prior art rejections in the final office action dated May 9, 2003 remain.

Claims 1 and 29 are amended to make explicit the inherent limitation in claims 1 and 29 that the image on the first surface is a *version* of the resultant image, modified by a first pattern of features, and that the image on the second surface is the *same version* of the resultant image, modified by a second pattern of features.


Applicant brings to the attention of the Examiner that the filed arguments never indicated that the images are identical but noted that the images are "nearly identical". The images are "nearly identical" in the sense that the images on the first and second surfaces *and the resultant image* are recognizable as versions of a same image. This is clearly shown in Figs. 1-3 and in the text which notes in describing Figs. 1 and 2 that "The features of the patterns in these two figures are much enlarged from those of a device which would give detailed images in a hand-held model of this size. For such a model, the real periods would be too small to be seen by the naked eye. *(which would result in nearly identical images, recognizable as versions of a same image)*... The level and scale of detail shown in Figs. 1 and 2 would be typical for a large area display sign, suitable for viewing at a distance of several meters or more" (page 12 last paragraph, parenthetical italicized remark added).

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner teaches directly or indirectly, or implies in any manner that the images on the first and second surfaces *and the resultant image* are nearly identical, recognizable versions of a same image. In view of the above remarks, applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 29 are patentable and that the

179/01406 A04

dependent claims are patentable through dependence on the independent claims or as a result of patentable material that they contain. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Benny PESACH


Allan C. ENTIS,
Reg. No. 52,866

June 3, 2004
Roy N. Envall, Jr.
c/o Anthony Castorina
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

Tel: (703) 415-1581